

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
From: "Nelson, Barry"
Sent: Mon 3/21/2011 11:33:27 PM
Subject: Imported Water Numbers
[Water District Pie Charts 3-11.pptx](#)
<http://www.smmirror.com/?ajax#mode=single&view=31826>
http://www.lacity.org/MAYOR/villaraigosaplan/EnergyandEnvironment/LACITY_004503.htm
http://www.laedc.org/scslc/studies/SCLC_SoCalWaterStrategies.pdf

As you can see, San Diego CWA plans to reduce reliance on MWD from 578,000 af in 1991 to 195,000 af in 2020. This trend is common in the integrated plans for MWD member agencies. We considered undertaking a comprehensive review of IRWM plans, but given that so many agencies are working on updates, we decided to wait. However, I have been collecting information on this issue for the past year or two. Also attached are three additional graphics, which are also summarized below.

Imported Water: Past, Present and Future

Water District

Past
Present
Future

San Diego County Water Authority

1991: 95%
(578 TAF)
2011: 48%

(286 TAF)
2020: 23%

(195 TAF)

City of Long Beach

2005: 51%
2010: 32%
-

West Basin Municipal Water District

1990: 79%
2008: 65%
2020: 43%

Water Replenishment District of Southern California

64%
20%
0%

Here are three more references, for which I do not have graphics.

- Santa Monica recently opened a groundwater treatment facility that will reduce their imported water requirements from 85% to 33%. <http://www.smmirror.com/?ajax#mode=single&view=31826>

- City of Los Angeles: "Securing LA's Water Supply" A 2008 plan to meet the City of Los Angeles' water needs until 2030 without more imported water.
http://www.lacity.org/MAYOR/villaraigosaplan/EnergyandEnvironment/LACITY_004503.htm

"the City will meet all new demand for water...through a combination of water conservation and water recycling." Other key strategies include stormwater capture, groundwater clean-up and groundwater storage.

- LA Country Economic Development Corporation: "Where Will We Get the Water?" (2008)
http://www.laedc.org/sclc/studies/SCLC_SoCalWaterStrategies.pdf

"There is no practical possibility of increased water deliveries from the Delta. Rather, Southern California's priority should be the implementation of a long-term fix that both protects the Delta as an ecosystem and tidal estuary and maintains exports as close to the pre-curtailement levels as is sustainable. [Quite apart from the environmental considerations, it is probably not in Southern California's interest to increase dependence on a water source that could be disrupted for a year or more if an earthquake or flood were to destroy levees in the Delta.]"

"Faced with these challenges and constraints on imported supplies, Southern California must embark on a concerted self-help program that replaces or augments imported water with locally sourced supplies."

Clearly, many agencies appear to be making significant progress in reducing their reliance on the Delta. We believe that the BDCP, DSC and related processes should take this trend into account when planning the future of the Delta.

Barry

